

SELF-RELIANCE OR MORE DEPENDENCE

Mrs. Indira Gandhi has of late, advanced the slogan of self-reliance. Though very catchy, in so far as politically unconscious common men of our country are concerned, the slogan itself is not new. In 1965, at the time of the first Indo-Pak war, when USA refused to supply India with military hardware, the then Prime Minister of India, Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri, raised this slogan. Since then it was put in cold storage till Mrs Gandhi has advanced the slogan afresh with a view to exploiting the patriotic sentiment of our people for further consolidating and strengthening the present exploiting capitalist regime.

At the outset we like to make it perfectly clear that, unlike the CPI, the CPI (M) and some other parties, we do not approach the question of self-reliance in isolation from the class character of society we live in. Self-reliance under socialism means further consolidation of socialist order guaranteeing further satisfaction of material and cultural needs of the people pushing the concerned country further towards classless society and complete emancipation of the people. But self-reliance of a capitalist country does not mean it, as it means further consolidation and strengthening of the capitalist system which is based on exploitation of the people by a handful of capitalists. India is a capitalist country and, hence, it will be naive to expect that India being self-reliant, our people will be free from exploitation and oppression.

Even if we leave aside this basic consideration while discussing the question of self-reliance, we will see that ruling Congress leaders are not even acting according to what they publicly profess. In fact, double standard—speaking one thing and doing just the reverse—has been the common practice of ruling Congress leaders. And in this matter also we find the same thing. On the one hand the ruling Congress is loudly proclaiming the virtues of self-reliance and on the other hand they are moving in the opposite direction. Let us produce facts to prove this charge.

First, in June, 1948, foreign private business investment in India amounted to Rs. 256 crores. In 1968,

it increased to Rs. 1137 crores. Now it is roughly Rs. 1400 crores. If one is sincere in making India self-reliant, one cannot but try to stop this continuously increasing amount of foreign imperialist finance capital exploiting our country and our people. Our people while engaged in anti-imperialist national liberation movement for national independence demanded confiscation of foreign imperialist finance capital invested in India. Let alone confiscation, Congress rulers are not prepared to even nationalize with compensation all foreign imperialist finance capital invested here. (This, of course, does not mean that we are advocating nationalization with compensation. We are for confiscation). They are not in favour of stopping further foreign private business investment in our country, rather, they are going the whole hog to see that more and more foreign imperialist finance capital is invested here, otherwise, Mr. B.B. Lall, Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Industrial Development, would not have "offered Britain relaxation of regulations governing foreign private investment and agreed to allow even the setting up of new subsidiaries of British companies" in India at the meeting of the Indo-British Technological Group, as reported by the **Economic Times**. Be it noted that about Rs. 140 crores goes out of our country every year as profits, dividends, interests, royalties, commissions, technical know-how and managerial fees, etc.

(Contd. to page 6)

Proletarian Era

ORGAN OF SOCIALIST UNITY CENTRE OF INDIA

(Fortnightly)

Editor-in-Chief—Shibdas Ghosh

VOL. 6
No. 1

15th AUGUST, '72
TUESDAY

PRICE 20 P.
Air Surcharge 4 P.

UTUC (Lenin Sarani)'s Memorandum to Bonus Review Committee

The UTUC (Lenin Sarani) has submitted a memorandum to the Bonus Review Committee in which it has demanded that minimum bonus at the rate of 8½ per cent of total annual earnings or Rs 150 per individual, whichever is higher, should be paid to all employed persons with retrospective effect from 1969. It has demanded the abolition of the upper limit of bonus payment fixed by the payment of Bonus Act, 1965.

The UTUC (Lenin Sarani) has strongly criticised the composition of the Bonus Review Committee as "not a representative body" as also the undemocratic way the committee has been formed without consulting with the UTUC (Lenin Sarani) and some other Central Trade Union Organisations in our country. Characterizing the payment of Bonus Act, 1965 as a "retrograde step taking away many of the rights of workers existing at the time when the Act was passed" the UTUC (Lenin Sarani) has in the memorandum observed as follows: "For the computation of bonus, the Payment of Bonus Act, 1965 takes gross profit as the starting point. The Act presumes that Balance Sheets and Profit and Loss Accounts of Corporations and Companies are accurate and reflect true state of affairs about the financial position of the Corporations or Companies concerned. This presumption is absolutely wrong. Window-dressing of

Balance Sheets and Profit and Loss Accounts with a view to evading payment of taxes to the Government, dividends to share-holders, bonus to workers, concealing real earning of employer etc., is an acknowledged fact. The very fact that, notwithstanding accounts of Companies being audited and balance Sheet and Profit and Loss accounts drawn up, employers of the Companies have amassed huge amount of black money proves conclusively the undependable character of Balance Sheets and Profit and Loss Accounts and the incorrectness of the presumption that Balance Sheets and Profit and Loss Accounts are correct. In the circumstances, Gross Profit as shown in the audited Balance Sheet and Profit and Loss Account cannot be taken as sacrosanct. But the payment of Bonus Act, 1965 thinks it almost as sacrosanct, in as much as it has virtually denied workers their right to inspect

(Contd. to page 5)

SIGNIFICANCE OF TRANSFER OF POWER

Present rulers of our country have decided to celebrate with *eclat* the silver jubilee of independence of India on August 15 this year. We cannot celebrate the day this year. We did not celebrate the day in previous years either. There are cogent reasons for this stand of ours. On this day we solemnly recall the glorious anti-imperialist struggle by our people for national independence and pay our most respectful homage to the martyrs who laid down their lives for ending alien rule in our country and, at the same time emancipating our people from all sorts of exploitation, economic, political, social and cultural.

In a class-divided society there is nothing which is supra-class, not even the concept of freedom. Our society is divided into classes; before independence also it was so. On the one side are the Tatas, Birlas, other monopolists and non-monopolist capitalists, jotedars, top bureaucrats, etc. who can be broadly classified as exploiters while on the other side are the exploited consisting of workers, poor peasants, lower middle peasants and lower middle class and other sections of the people. One may not like this division but it cannot be disputed, since we are historically placed like that. Now for the simple reason that exploiters and the exploited have got basically different and diametrically opposite aspirations and interests, freedom of exploiters can never be the freedom of the exploited. In fact, the two cannot co-exist. If there is freedom of exploiters to exploit the people, there cannot be freedom of the people, in as much as freedom of the exploited means emancipation of the people from all sorts of exploitation.

In the light of this historical truth the character of independence India has won is to be judged. We all know that when India was under the colonial rule of the British imperialists, the Indian bourgeoisie could not freely exploit the natural resources and the people of the country according to their will and capacity. The British colonial rule was an insurmountable obstacle in the path of fulfilment of the aspiration of the Indian bourgeoisie for achiev-

ing relatively the freest, widest and speediest development of Indian capitalism in all spheres. The national reformist section of the Indian bourgeoisie correctly felt that there was no other way of their aspiration being fulfilled than the end of alien political rule in our country. So, not to end domestic and foreign exploitation but to anyhow end the political rule of the British imperialists and, in its place, establish their own class rule so that they can become the master of India and freely exploit it, the national reformist section of the Indian bourgeoisie joined hands with the really anti-imperialist masses of India in the struggle against British imperialism for national independence. The masses of the Indian people, however, were conducting the national liberation movement not only to end alien political rule and gain national independence but also to end all sorts of exploitation of man by man and win real freedom. Thus, the national reformist section of the Indian bourgeoisie and the masses of the Indian people, though they unitedly fought against British imperialist rule in our country, had basically different aims and objectives.

Had there been a real revolutionary working class party in our country then, it would have been in the thick of anti-imperialist national liberation movement with the people, strengthened the anti-imperialist national liberation front, carried relentless ideological struggles against the Congress and other bourgeois and petty-

bourgeois parties in the front without, of course, weakening the unity of the front and the struggle against British imperialism, exposed their political bankruptcy and anti-people opportunist roles, isolated these compromising parties from the struggling people, established their ideological, political and organisational leadership over the people, made the national-democratic revolution under the leadership of the working class victorious and thereby not only achieved national independence but also opened up the road for transition to socialism and consequent emancipation of the people. In China the Communist Party of China did it very successfully. The Communists in Vietnam are doing it. Every real communist party adopts this line. But that was not the case with the so-called Communist Party of India. Thanks to their right opportunist followed by left adventurist again followed by right opportunist lines, leadership of the national liberation movement was usurped by the national reformist section of the Indian bourgeoisie represented by the leadership of the Indian National Congress and to the anti-imperialist masses of the Indian people struggling for national liberation communism became an anathema. This provided opportunity to the national reformist section of the Indian bourgeoisie to capture state power through compromise with British imperialism.

The end of British imperialist rule and capture of political power by the national reformist section of the Indian bourgeoisie has consummated the establishment of a bourgeois national state in our country. It means that though national independence has been won, liberation of the masses is yet to be achieved, in as much as our people are still

subjected to economic exploitation, political persecution, social oppression and cultural deprivation. It is for this reason that our party does not celebrate but has been observing August 15 as a People's Liberation Pledge Day.

With the establishment of the bourgeois national state, conditions have been created for relatively the freest, widest and speediest development of Indian capitalism. The Indian bourgeoisie is making all-out efforts to consolidate their power and develop India as a powerful capitalist country not only economically but also militarily in the shortest possible time by mobilizing all their resources, achieving concentration of capital, trying to minimize antagonistic contradictions between individual capitalists through control, regulation and planning, setting up basic and heavy industries under state sector, nationalizing some industries, bringing about coalescence of the state with private monopolists, developing state monopoly capitalism and increasingly subjugating the state to monopoly interests so as to present a united face of the Indian bourgeoisie against internal movements by the Indian people and external competition from foreign imperialist capitalists. Indian capitalism today is not weak, as is imagined by some so-called communists. It has given birth to not only strong monopoly and state capitalism but also state monopoly capitalism. In fact, Indian capitalism has already assumed imperialist character and the present Indian state is increasingly showing imperialist tendencies, a fact established by export of Indian finance capital abroad, the setting up of joint ventures with Indian participation in foreign countries, including some highly developed capitalist countries, and

(Contd. to page 3)

HELP SUC IN EVERY WAY

(Contd. from page 2)

recent decision of the Indian Government "to relax restrictions on Indian equity participation in joint ventures abroad."

But when world capitalist economy has lost even the relative stability of market which it used to enjoy till the second world war and is ridden with serious crises, it is naive to think that India with capitalist economy can carry out industrial revolution. In the present era of imperialism and the proletarian revolution, more so in its present phase marked by loss of relative stability of market by world capitalist economy referred to above, capitalism is incapable of carrying out industrial revolution. As a matter of fact, whatever industrial development India has succeeded in achieving is already associated with a shadow of crisis, resulting in closure of a large number of industries, large-scale non-utilization of installed capacities in industries, stagnation of growth, etc., to stem the tide of which at least for the time being the Indian state is injecting artificial stimulation to the economy through increased orders by the state for military production. But this is failing to bring the desired result, as it is bound to fail. This militarization of economy is rather intensifying the crisis. With intensification of crisis, the ruling Indian bourgeoisie and their main political representative, the ruling Congress and the Congress governments, are mounting attacks on the people from all directions. Like the fascists of other countries, the ruling bourgeoisie in our country also has adopted dual tactics—on the one hand, they are carrying on fascistic attacks to liquidate political opponents, their mass organisations and democratic mass struggles (even using armed forces and armed Congress hoodlums) and, on the other hand, they are

trying to win over the masses, particularly the backward section, of the people by granting some concessions to them through Social-Democratic programmes and tall promises.

Two roads are now open to our people. They are to choose one of them. They may follow the road charted out by the ruling Congress. It will ultimately lead the country to facism, even though small production, which still plays a significant role in the total capitalist economy of the country and consequent regional bourgeois interests, which are often raising their heads against many official policies, are impediments to all-out development of facism in our country. Nevertheless, symptoms of administrative facism are coming to the surface more markedly with the passage of time. The other road is to go whole hog in creating necessary condition for making anti-capitalist socialist revolution in India successful. The former road will mean not only more exploitation and oppression and slavery of the people but also complete destruction of all the values of life which our people so dearly cherish and nurture, while the latter road will lead to emancipation of our people from all sorts of exploitation, establish higher form of culture and human values and ensure uninterrupted social progress. But without a real revolutionary working class party the people cannot be led along the second road to power and emancipation. The parties that move in our country with the name Communist attached to them are not real Communist parties. They are petty-bourgeois parties masquerading as Communist party. In India the SUCI is the only real revolutionary working class party that can lead people to power and emancipation. So, strengthen the SUCI by all means. That is the demand of history.

By The Way

Statesman (July 19 last) reported: "Cheaper varieties of clothes have become costlier during the past four months. A mill-made coarse dhoti which was available at Rs. 7.50 before March is now sold at Rs. 8.75 and the price of a sari is Rs. 13.50 against Rs. 11. The price of long-cloth, much in demand among the poorer section, has increased about three-fold. A metre of long-cloth which could be had at Re. 1 only some months ago is now priced at Rs. 2.75" This is "garibi hatao" in action.

Statesman (July 16 last) reported: "Pressing the demand that the man who had been arrested on Thursday should be immediately released and a revolver which he allegedly had and which had been seized by the police should be returned to him, a section of Congress supporters" demonstrated before the Baranagar Thana. "Another Group of Congress supporters, with several hundred people, also staged a demonstration before the Thana" urging the "police to take a strong action against the Law-breaker." You say, this is factional conflict within the Congress? No, no, this is an instance of unity in diversity, an acknowledged characteristic of India according to writers of Indian history.

Amrita Bazar Patrika (July 28 last) reported: "A young girl aged about 17 years was Kidnapped from the Mrinalini Cinema house at Dum Dum area during the interval of the evening show on Wednesday by seven young men of the locality who all in a row raped her in a nearby secluded place." These men are "members of a local party." The newspaper owned by the West Bengal Commerce and Industry Minister has not given the name of the local party to which these persons belong. **Jugantar** (July 29 last) another daily owned by the same Congress Minister, reported: "Last Sunday night some young men forcibly took away a young girl from the Platform of Khardah railway station and raped her." You see how the people of West Bengal are living under normal democratic atmosphere, as claimed by the State's Chief Minister.

Hindusthan Standard (August 3 last) reported: Mr. Profulla Kanti Ghosh, Sports Minister, "Openly charged that quite a large number of his followers—all respectable persons in their locality—were arrested during the last 48 hours at the instance of Mr. Subrata Mukherjee who looks after the Home (Police) administration." A few days back the people of West Bengal very much enjoyed mutual bickerings between Dr. Jainal Abedin, Minister for Public Undertakings and Mr. Santosh Roy, Rehabilitation Minister in public. Prior to that the former Minister and the Irrigation and Power Minister publicly accused each other over the performance of the Durgapur Project Ltd. Who says that Ministerial feuds are heading for a climax? The Congress Ministry in West Bengal is a happy family and these mutual bickerings are only expressions of love!

GAUHATI UNIVERSITY ON MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION

Gauhati, July 15—On June 12 last, the Academic Council of the Gauhati University "in partial modification of its earlier decision" by a resolution decided "that (i) Assamese shall be the medium of instruction in colleges under the jurisdiction of Gauhati University; (ii) English shall continue as an alternative medium of instruction till such time not exceeding ten years; (iii) students shall have option to answer either in Assamese or in English in the university examinations; (iv) the above decisions shall come into force with effect from the session 1972-73 in respect of two-year pre-university course and from 1974-75 in respect of two-year degree course." The earlier decision referred to in the resolution provided that the medium of instruction "shall be only in Assamese or English" with option to students "to answer in Assamese or Bengali or English or Hindi."

The Assam State Committee of the SUCI has issued a lengthy statement on this decision of the Gauhati University. We publish below some of its salient points. In the statement the State Committee has observed that "the love of the Assamese-speaking people for their mother tongue is only natural and it is a fact that during British imperialist rule in our country the alien rulers in collusion with some ICS officers tried to suppress Assamese language in all possible ways in the most undemocratic manner the result of which has not been good. Be that as it may, in the interests of all round improvement of education both in terms of quantity and quality, mother tongue of the taught should be his or her medium of instruction and examination. Hence, Assamese must be the medium of instruction and examination for Assamese-speaking students in colleges under the jurisdiction of not only the Gauhati University but other universities as well even outside the state of Assam. But the mother tongues of the tea garden labourers of Sibsaigar, Dibrugarh, Lakhimpur and Darrang districts, the Ahoms of Upper Assam, the plains tribals of Goalpara, Kamrup and Darrang, the Bengali-speaking people spread over in Cachar district and rest of the Brahmaputra Valley, the inhabitants of the two

autonomous hill districts of North Cachar and Mikir Hills, not to speak of the people of Meghalaya, Mizoram, Manipur, Nagaland and Arunachal Pradesh, which are not now included in Assam proper but, nevertheless, colleges there are under the jurisdiction of the Gauhati University, are not Assamese. These linguistic minorities love their respective mother tongues as the Assamese-speaking people love Assamese and naturally do not like imposition of Assamese on them, as the Assamese people did not like imposition of Bengali language on them by British imperialist rulers in connivance with some ICS officers. These linguistic minorities must have the right and real opportunity of receiving education through their respective mother tongues. Without protection of this right of these linguistic minorities, any attempt to foist Assamese language as the sole medium of instruction and examination on non-Assamese-speaking students (English will remain as an alternative medium for any period not exceeding ten years) in colleges under the jurisdiction of the Gauhati University would be an undemocratic act."

The State Committee further states that "though switching over to mother tongue as medium of instruction and examination is

necessary for quantitative and qualitative improvement of education, it should not be done particularly in case of higher education so long as (i) the concerned mother tongue is not so developed as it can adequately express the most intricate and modern thoughts in different branches of knowledge, (ii) there are not enough teachers capable of teaching upto the highest level through the medium of the said mother tongue and (iii) there are not sufficient standard books on different branches of knowledge published in that mother tongue. Premature switching over to mother tongue without making necessary preparations for the switch over may satisfy one's provincial or chauvinistic feeling but that will be at the cost of education, inasmuch as it will lower the already low quality of education in our country, not excluding that in Assam. The experience of some states which had switched over to their respective regional languages for imparting higher education calls for opposition to any premature change over. To avoid this danger, the State Committee demands that all-out efforts, including necessary financial and other assistance, should be made by the Central and the State Governments to rapidly develop the Assamese language and the languages of the linguistic minorities in Assam and adjoining areas under the jurisdiction of the Gauhati University so that the switching over to mother tongues can be possible in the shortest possible time without in any way lowering the quality of education."

The State Committee thirdly observes that "even when people speaking different tongues will have their respective mother tongues as their medium of instruction and examination, there still will remain the necessity of a Common link

language for exchange of ideas in the field of higher education, research work and higher thought. In this connection it should be realized that language is not merely a medium of communication between people. It is also the vehicle of thinking itself, as no man can think in vacuum. Man thinks only with the help of language materials. So, a language which is undeveloped and poor is not only weak as a medium of communication and, so, incapable of adequately expressing modern and intricate thoughts. It is at the same time an impediment to higher thinking. Hence, the link language in the sphere of higher education and higher thought has to be a rich, developed, modern language capable of adequately expressing all intricate and modern thoughts. The State Committee is of considered view that in the prevailing situation in our country only English can serve as this link language in the sphere of higher education and higher thought and, so, teaching of English should be improved and not neglected as at present. The State Committee opposes the three-language formula and demands immediate replacement of it by the two-language formula under which a student will have to learn compulsorily only two languages, the first language being his or her mother tongue and the other language English."

The State Committee has expressed grave concern at the said decision of the Gauhati University "which is of great political import and has already created a feeling of uncertainty among the non-Assamese-speaking people, particularly the Bengali-speaking people of Cachar district, in Assam. Forcible imposition of Assamese on non-Assamese-speaking people is apt to create misunderstanding and disrupt the unity

(Contd. to page 8)

MINIMUM BONUS, FIRST CHARGE ON EMPLOYERS

(Contd. from page 1)

accounts and secure all break-up figures of income and expenditure and other deductions and necessary clarifications thereon. It has unfairly left the important matter of ascertaining the correctness or otherwise of Balance Sheets and Profit and Loss Accounts to the discretion of the Government for reference to a Tribunal or any other authority only in the event of a *prima facie* case being made out, showing the incorrectness of the Balance-Sheet or Profit and Loss Account. It has even gone to the extent of denying the Tribunal its right to go into the important question of correct valuation of the stocks, correct allocation of capital and revenue expenditures as also excessive expenditure on account of commission, fees, travelling allowance, other perquisites of Directors, Managing Agents, Managers, etc. for the crucial purpose of ascertaining real Gross Profit for the year concerned.

"While the Labour Appellate Tribunal and the Supreme Court usually used to grant no higher return on the paid-up Capital than 6 percent and not more than 4 percent on the Reserves (and that too only to the extent actually utilised as working capital) and even a lower rate of 2 percent return in case of such Reserves as had not been really employed as working capital for all the months of the year, Bonus Commission increased the return on Paid-up Capital to 7 percent and the Government further increased it to 8.5 percent which have been provided in the Payment of Bonus Act. Both the Commission and the Government increased the return on all Reserves to 6 percent as prior charge on Gross Profit, irrespective of any consideration as to whether they are utilised as working Capital or not. The Act also provides it.

Both the Commission and the Government recommended payment of bonus in full to workers only when they had worked on all the working days in a year and proportionate prorata payment to workers according to the number of days they had worked, thereby depriving workers of the then existing benefit of payment of bonus in full for working 60 days or more and 50 percent of the bonus for working less than 60 days but more than 30 days in a year, a right granted by Tribunals and upheld by the Supreme Court. This curtailment of existing right has been incorporated in the Bonus Act. Furthermore, though Tribunals and the Supreme Court allowed bonus to all workmen excepting only those who had been dismissed for misconduct involving financial loss to employers (in case of financial loss to the employer, the extent of the loss incurred used to be deducted from the bonus) both the Commission and the Government had deprived workers of the benefit of bonus in all cases of dismissal on ground of other types of misconduct. It has been provided in the Act. The Act further has included all direct taxes as prior charges as against only Income tax and Super-tax as recommended by the Commission. Then again, prior to the enactment of the Payment of Bonus Act, 1965, establishments employing less than 20 persons had been paying bonus to their respective employees but the Act has excluded these establishments from its purview, as a result of which workers in establishments employing less than 20 persons are getting no bonus. The Act has granted exemption to various classes of establishments from payment of bonus to their workers. These are just a few illustrations to prove the reactionary character of the Payment of

Bonus Act, 1965, even compared to the principles laid down and or upheld by Industrial Tribunals, Labour Appellate Tribunals or the Supreme Court, as the case may be, on the issue of payment of bonus to workers.

"There was another attack on workers on the issue of bonus when the Supreme Court struck down Section 33, 34 (2) and Section 37 as unconstitutional. The striking down of Section 34 (2) which provided for the choice by labour of the formula which was to its advantage and protected the payment of existing rate of bonus as settled through a settlement or award or agreement even if this rate was higher than the rate allowable under the Payment of Bonus Act, 1965 was a great blow to workers."

About the actual quantum of minimum bonus and coverage the UTUC (Lenin Sarani) has demanded that "the minimum bonus at the rate of 4 per cent of the annual basic wage plus the dearness allowance or Rs. 40/- per individual, whichever is higher, payable now under the payment of Bonus Act, 1965 **should be raised to 8½ percent of the total annual earnings or Rs. 150/- per individual whichever is higher.**

"The demand of payment of minimum bonus at the rate of 8½ percent suggested by us is not new. Much before, Mr. Siddhartha Sankar Roy, the then Union Minister-in-Charge of West Bengal, announced a minimum bonus of 8 percent for the workers of Jessop & Co., Calcutta, in the year 1971 or the Union Labour Minister spoke in a conference of the consensus on payment of minimum bonus at the rate of 8½ percent in August, 1971, the Labour Minister of the first United Front

Government in West Bengal, Mr. Subodh Banerjee, in a meeting of the then State Labour Advisory Board held sometimes in the month of July or August 1967, requested the management to pay minimum bonus at least at the rate of 8 percent of the annual basic wage plus dearness allowance to each individual worker and the management had to pay it willy nilly." The memorandum categorically states that minimum bonus is to be "paid to all employed persons, no matter whether they work in factories, mines, plantations, establishments employing less than 20 workers, private sector or public sector undertakings, establishments run by Government departments, Co-operative societies, Port and Dock, LIC, Reserve Bank of India, solicitors' and auditors' firms, Railway, research and educational institutions, Local Self Government bodies, under contractors or any other place. The exemption granted under the Payment of Bonus Act, 1965 to different classes of establishments should be withdrawn. The minimum bonus at 8½ percent of total annual earnings or Rs. 150 per individual, whichever is higher as claimed by us, is only a very modest way to partially bridge the increasing gap between declining real wage and spiralling high prices.

This minimum has no relevance to profit or loss, the number of persons employed, whether the establishment is old or new or whether it is run by the private sector, the public sector, Government department or anybody else. It should not be also subject to any 'set off' against subsequent years' profit. It should

(Contd. to page 8)

INDIA WORLD'S BIGGEST DEBTOR COUNTRY

(Contd. from page 1)

on account of foreign private business investment in India, a great drain on our resources.

Second, now take the case of so-called collaboration agreements entered into between foreign countries and India, not on state level but on private level. Upto 1971, there had been about 3600 such agreements approved by the Government of India of which roughly 2500 agreements have been made with only four countries, namely, Great Britain, Japan, West Germany and the USA. Besides, only 800 of them stipulate financial participation, the rest stipulate supply of technical know-how, intermediate raw materials and spare parts. When India itself is making agreements with foreign countries for supply of technical know-how, when 70,000 Indian engineers are unemployed, cannot many of these unemployed engineers be absorbed in the projects covered by these collaboration agreements? When it will one day be necessary to replace foreign technical hands by Indian experts, is it not prudent to train Indian engineers so as to enable them to replace foreign technical experts in the shortest possible time? And for that simple reason is it not incumbent that these so-called collaboration agreements should provide for training of Indian personnel for ultimate take-over of work by Indian engineers? But most of these agreements do not provide for that. The reason is simple. The foreign imperialist countries want to foist their unemployed technical experts on India and continue as long as possible economic exploitation of India by way of fat salaries and perquisites of such experts. When our 70,000 unemployed engineers are starving, most of these so-called foreign experts are

leading lives of kings with monthly salaries and other perquisites amounting in many cases to Rs. 30,000.

Third, now about debt position. India today is perhaps world's biggest debtor country. This is a gift of twenty-five years of uninterrupted Congress rule since independence. In 1947, India was a creditor country with a foreign exchange reserve of 1600 crore pounds. But in 1971-72, total amount of public debt in India was Rs. 15,055 crores of which foreign debts totalled Rs. 8028 crores. The USA and the Aid India Consortium, principal contributor of which is again the USA, together account for more than 80 per cent of India's total foreign debt. As matters stand now, yearly payment towards repayment of principal and interest on foreign loans amounts to about Rs. 500 crores which is almost one-third of India's present annual export earnings. Mrs. Gandhi and her Government do not visualise an end of loans from foreign countries in near future. For, in the Approach paper to Fifth Plan the Planning Commission has expressed the hope that even after 1980-81 foreign 'aid' will continue to come at the present level of Rs. 550 crore annually.

If from these facts, which show that India's capitalist economy is becoming increasingly dependent economically on foreign imperialist countries, one concludes that the talk of self-reliance by the Prime Minister of India is a political gimmick to exploit patriotic sentiments of our people to further capitalist interests, one would not be wrong. Our people should know that the capitalist class and their main political representative, the ruling Congress and Governments run by them, care more for profits. They are no believer of the maxim '*vincet amor patriae*', meaning

that the love of country will prevail. For, there cannot be true love of country without real love for the people. Capitalists and their political representatives have no love for the people; they sometimes feign love with the ulterior motive of bamboozling the people.

We like to sound a note of caution here. Some so-called communists in our country take this increasing economic dependence of India on foreign imperialists to prove their absurd theory that India is not really a sovereign independent country, the political independence it has gained is only formal and India is a satellite of foreign imperialist powers. On earlier occasions we demolished this absurd theory of these pseudo-communists. We do not like to dilate on all the points here, since the subject matter of this article is different. But, nevertheless, we will just touch one or two points here. Firstly, it should be borne in mind that economic dependence "has nothing whatever to do with the question of national state." In refuting Rosa Luxemburg's wrong idea about national movement and national state, Lenin said these very words. If any one wants to verify it, he or she may go through his **The Right Of Nations To Self-Determination**. America, after it attained political independence, "was economically a colony of Europe, as Marx pointed out in *Capital*,.....but it has nothing whatever to do with the question of national movements and the national state." (Ibid) Is not Great Britain today economically dependent on the USA to a very large extent? But for it will any sane man say that Great Britain is not the sovereign independent national state of the British bourgeoisie? Innumerable instances to show the absurdity of the theory of these pseudo-communists may

be cited but there is no necessity of that. Secondly, it should also be borne in mind that capitalism exhibits two different tendencies at two different stages of its development. In the stage of its earlier development the tendency expresses itself in the form of the awakening of national life and national movements, the struggle against all national oppression for the creation of the national state. But when the national state is established and the bourgeoisie, which in the early stage of development of capitalism carried on struggles against all national oppression, develops into monopolists, the second tendency appears which expresses itself in the form of attempts to accelerate international intercourse in every way by breaking down national barriers for achieving international unity of capital, economic life in general, politics, science, etc. "Both tendencies are a universal law of capital." (Lenin. **Critical Remarks On The National Question**). Our Party led by its General Secretary, Com. Shibdas Ghosh, one of the outstanding Marxist-Leninist thinkers of the day, on the basis of these Leninist teachings, has concluded that increasing investment of foreign finance capital in India and of Indian finance capital in foreign countries is no proof of the absurd Naxalite theory that India is a satellite of foreign imperialist Powers. It is an expression of the second tendency of capitalism mentioned above. In the present days when the bourgeoisie has thrown overboard the banner of complete national independence and picked up the flag of cosmopolitanism, investment of finance capital of one capitalist country in another capitalist country has become the order of the day. That is why we find that not only the powerful imperialist

(Contd. to page 7)

CHINA HAS NO DEBT, INTERNAL OR FOREIGN

(Contd. from page 6)

countries, like the USA, Great Britain, France, Canada, etc., but a capitalist country, like India, also is investing its finance capital in powerful imperialist countries, like Great Britain, Canada, West Germany and even America.

Let us return to the subject matter of discussion of this article, leaving the digression at this point. Thus, it is clear by now that Mrs. Indira Gandhi's exhortation for self-reliance is not sincere. It is a deliberate attempt to exploit patriotic sentiment of our people to further capitalist interests. Perhaps, it will not be out of place to examine the case of the People's Republic of China in this regard. Both India and China are large countries with huge population, China's population being larger than India's by more than 25 crores which is not a matter of joke. Both the countries were very poor, notwithstanding vast natural wealth and huge man power, due to exploitation by foreign imperialists and native exploiting classes before they gained independence. In this respect China's condition was far worse, its economy being completely ruined by war against Japanese imperialists and civil war against native feudalism and bureaucratic capitalism. Both the countries became politically independent almost at the same time, India gaining political independence through compromise with British imperialism in 1947 while China achieving liberation in 1949 by waging revolutionary war against Japanese imperialists and native feudalists and bureaucratic capitalists. Before liberation China's economy was primitive, that was not the case with India. China's industrial development in 1949 when it was liberated was many many leagues behind India's. Indeed the People's Republic of China had to begin from the scratch.

Still today China is a mighty socialist country far surpassing India in every respect. It is the only country in the world which has no public debt. Through bonds it raised funds from internal sources to the extent of 384 crore yuans which amounted to 482 crore yuans with interest. This internal debt had been completely redeemed by the end of 1968. So, now it has no internal public debt. China received foreign loan only from the Soviet Union at the time of the Korean war totalling 140 crore new roubles in principal and interest. This foreign loan too had been cleared off by China by the beginning of 1965, almost a year ahead of the due time for repayment, notwithstanding national calamities China faced from 1959 to 1961 when the Soviet Union under Khrushchev's leadership suddenly withdrew all economic and technical assistances causing serious dislocation and damage to China's economy. Thus, China is now free from both internal and foreign debts. The stupendousness of this achievement can be better realized, if we compare this achievement of China with the debt-position of world's two most powerful imperialist capitalist countries. According to official figures, unpaid internal debts in bonds as at the end of July, 1968 of USA totalled 35,170 crore dollars while its foreign debts upto May that year amounted to 3,310 crore dollars. Great Britain's internal debts in bonds at the end of March 1968 totalled 3,350 crore pounds while its foreign debts till June that year stood at 560 crore pounds. Since then debt-position of both the countries has become worse.

Not only this. Chinese people are not to live below poverty level. But more than 40 per cent of our people do not get even two

most ordinary meals a day; 70 per cent of our children suffer from mal-nutrition. Living conditions of the Chinese people are continuously improving. The door of uninterrupted social progress is open to them whereas insecurity in life in every sphere stares us in the face. This is because China is a real socialist country where the people are actually in power and, hence, are masters of their own present

and future, whereas India is a capitalist country where the bourgeoisie is in power and exploiting the people. Unless the present exploiting and oppressive capitalist order in our country is replaced by a socialist order free from exploitation of man by man, our people will not be in a position to build their own future. Let our people continue their struggle for that change.

LEFT FRONT TO DEVELOP MOVEMENT

Calcutta, August 10—The Left Front in West Bengal comprising the CPI(M), RSP, SUC, RCPI, Workers' Party, MFB and Biplabi Bangla Congress together with the FB has decided to build up a campaign on some issues for mobilising public opinion on the widest possible scale in favour of mass movements.

Among the issues are eviction of bargadars from land they have been cultivating for decades, of poor licencees from land vested with the government and allotted to the licencees by JLRO'S and landless and poor peasants from benami land of jotedars, who have kept land above ceiling fixed by law fraudulently, recovered and occupied by such peasants during the UF regime, by jotedars backed by Congress hoodlums, R. G. Party personnel and the police, government's decision to increase the rate of land revenue on lower middle peasants in order to give relief to jotedars, proposal to increase water tax, acute unemployment in the state, retrenchment and lay-off of workers and closure of industrial units, forcible prevention of workers of left democratic parties by Congress hoodlums from going to places of work

and residence, rise in prices of essential articles, increased taxation, failure of electricity, centre's anti-West Bengal attitude in respect of Farakka Project and ganges water-flow and fixation of prices of raw jute and cotton, attack on education, educational institutions and teachers by workers of Chhatra parishad, continued reign of terror in villages and town, detention of large number of political workers without trial, institution of thousands of false cases against poor peasants and workers of left democratic parties and their mass organisations, using the administration and the police to establish the power of the Congress and Congress alone, etc., etc.

The Left Front and the Forward Bloc have called upon the left democratic parties, mass organisations and democratically minded people to take up the above issues and develop movements.

38,000 People Rendered Homeless

Berhampore, West Bengal, August 5—As a result of erosion by the Ganga, 38,000 people of 80 villages covering an area of about 17 square miles in Jangipur sub-division in the district of Murshidabad have been rendered homeless. The area under Farakka, Suti, Shamshegunj and Raghunathgunj Thanas are worst-affected.

This erosion is neither new nor sudden. It has been going on for years together but the rate of erosion has increased since 1969. Local people organised by the Murshidabad district Committee of the SUCI and the Krishak Khet Majoor Federation have made repeated representations to the district authorities and the State Government but to no effect. Exasperated they came in a mass deputation, several thousands strong, to the Governor at Calcutta on 13th September, 1971, to impress upon him the necessity of taking some immediate steps not only to provide relief to the affected persons and rehabilitate them but also to check continuous erosion by the Ganga. The Governor assured the demonstrators of necessary measures. But no step was taken by the Government and now the situation has become worse.

The affected people this time are not going to tolerate this nonsense. But the SDO, Jangipur sub-division, now pleads helplessness on the plea of the paucity of fund and legal difficulties. As these homeless people do not possess any land, he contends, they are not entitled to any house-building loans or grants. So, the scheme for providing each of these people with a small plot of land and a paltry sum to raise a hut thereon which would cost only Rs. 14 lakhs has not received approval of the Government. The result is that these 38,000 people are now residing on highway side land with practically no protection from the rain and the sun. Of course, the propaganda that the present ruling Congress Government

in the State has given land and house-building grants to the people who have no houses is finding wide publicity in newspapers and through the All India Radio. This is the usual Congress practice.

Gauhati University

(Contd. from page 4)

of the people which must be preserved like the apple of an eye. For, in the ultimate analysis it is the unity of the people organised under the leadership of a real revolutionary working class party that is the real guarantee for replacing the present capitalist order by socialism."

The State Committee in the end has criticised the language policy of the Congress governments which has "fostered disunity among the people of India", condemned the policies of some so-called left parties in Assam and their student organisations that are fanning provincialism on the question of medium of instruction and examination as an easy way to expand their influence, appealed to the Gauhati University authorities "to desist from giving effect to the latest decision on medium of instruction and imposing Assamese on non-Assamese-speaking students in colleges under the jurisdiction of the university", and called upon "the democratically minded people in general and students in particular not to be a victim of provincialism but to maintain the unity of the people and make the university authorities revise the wrong decision on the medium of instruction".

Fixation of Upper Limit Should be Abolished

(Contd. from page 5)

not be related in any way to production productivity. The suggestion that "the present minimum bonus of 4 percent may continue but a provision be made for its being supplemented through suitable scheme of production/productivity" is not acceptable to us. Our point is that minimum bonus should be the first charges on the employer, irrespective of any condition.

The question of production/productivity has relation with incentive to production scheme or production bonus. In no way can production/productivity be linked up with the question of payment of minimum bonus."

The UTUC has demanded that pending final disposal of the matter there should be an interim award which should be out before the end of August next. The final award should be "published not later than December this year. The interim as well as final recommendations shall come into force with retrospective effect from 1969."

On the question of maximum bonus, the memorandum clearly states "the UTUC (Lenin Sarani) is of considered view that the upper limit fixed by the Payment of Bonus Act, 1965 should be abolished. The existing provision setting upper limit on payment of bonus is a concession given by the Government to flourishing concerns making fabulous profits and capable of giving more than 20 percent of the total wages as bonus. This concession to the highly profitable concerns is an expression of pro-monopoly outlook of the

Establishment. Workers strongly object to this attitude on the part of the Government. The slogan of "economic growth with social justice" advanced by the ruling party and the Government becomes an empty verbosity in the fact of this concession given to the Tycoones."

JOTEDARS ATTACK KHET MAZDOORS

On 24th July last a gang of goondas armed with lethal weapons and organised by some big money-lender Jotedars of village Repura-Rasulpur under the jurisdiction of kanti P. S. in the district of Muzaffarpur made an attack on the Khet Mazdoors of the said village who under the banner of Kisan Aur Khet Mazdoor Sangh led by the Bihar State Committee of the S.U.C.I. have demanded a wage-increase and been conducting their struggle for the realisation of the said demand most democratically and peacefully for about a month. Com. Dholan Mahto, an important local organiser of the Kisan Aur Khet Mazdoor Sangh, and several others unarmed and poor Khet Mazdoors were brutally assaulted by the goondas at the instigation of the money-lender jotedars. With grave injuries on his person Com. Dholan Mahto is lying in hospital in a precarious condition.

The said big money-lender Jotedars of Repura-Rasulpur in an attempt to cover up their afore-said misdeed and misguide the right-thinking public and the police are now raising a bogey of so-called Naxalite attack on them and are trying to paint the struggling Khet Mazdoors organised under the Kisan Aur Khet Mazdoor Sangh led by the S.U.C. as Naxalites in order to harass them further.